3/21/88 U8960-2A

uebr

Utah Economic and Business Review

Volume 48
Numbers 1 and 2
January – February
1988

BEBR

graduate school
of business
bureau of economic and
business research
university of utah

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY

Boyd Fjeldsted, Garth Mangum and Jeff Waddoups*

During the 1950s and 1960s a pattern of urban sprawl spread over the metropolitan areas of the United States. The resulting suburbanization of residency and retail shopping, decentralization of manufacturing, but continued centralization of commerce required massive daily automobile ingress and egress into central business districts. The lifestyle of the urban society was perceived as deteriorating under the pressures of congestion, environmental pollution, the emergence of poverty among central city residents and a general loss of community. One national response seeking to relieve these pressures was the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964.

Part of the national experience had been that the social responsibilities of an urban mass transit system were so substantial that it was rarely possible for an unsubsidized, private-for-profit system to offer the level of service demanded. The primary thrust of UMTA was to provide federal capital grants and later, operating grants to encourage state and local governments to initiate and expand mass transit.

UTA History

The pressures of the national pattern were not yet seriously impacting the metropolitan area along the Wasatch Front in Utah, but it was readily apparent to the more alert, civic and political leaders that the trends were in the same direction and the emergence of similar problems only a matter of time for Utah. Minimal bus service was available in the Ogden and Provo areas. The private bus company serving the Salt Lake area was experiencing losses and threatening to withdraw. The need for a publicly subsidized urban transit system for the Wasatch Front was becoming increasingly apparent.

Beginning in 1969, the Utah State Legislature began a series of legislative actions which culminated in 1974 with sales tax for funding of the Utah Transit Authority (UTA). In addition to federal grants, public support would consist of revenues from a .25 percent sales tax levied in transit districts approved by majority votes in those municipalities, counties and combinations thereof along the Wasatch Front which chose to be served. Years of frenetic activity went

*Boyd Fjeldsted is Senior Research Economist, BEBR; Garth Mangum is McGraw Professor of Economics; and Jeff Waddoups, graduate student in Economics, University of Utah

into acquiring equipment and facilities, recruiting, selecting and training personnel, establishing routes, developing a maintenance system and marketing services. Bus service has been expanded from Ogden to Provo along the Wasatch Front with fingers reaching out to major employing establishments and ski resorts throughout the service area. Urban mass transit services are now available to 70 percent of the state's population. Ridership in 1986 consisted of 15.4 million linked passenger trips (a linked trip is one trip for a passenger including any transfers), and involved 11.8 million revenue miles. But all of that is not without cost, both to the users of the services and to the general public.

The Case for Subsidizations

Nowhere in the modern world are mass transit systems in major metropolitan areas unsubsidized, private-for-profit businesses. The reason is something economists like to call externalities. Private investors put their capital where they can expect the greatest return commensurate with risk. Business enterprises continue to produce as long as they can sell their output at a price sufficient to cover all costs and provide an adequate net revenue. Consumers purchase a good or service as long as they get more satisfaction from it than from the next most promising use of their purchasing power. The costs of production and return on capital on the one hand and the consumer satisfaction on the other are internalized in the market transactions between suppliers and producers, sellers and buyers.

However, many transactions have costs and benefits external to the market transaction. Air and water pollution from an industrial enterprise is an example of external costs. The cost of raw materials, labor and energy going into a factory are all part of the costs of production paid for by the producer and passed on to the consumer; while the costs to society of the pollution belched out of a smokestack are not. Those external costs can be avoided or reimbursed only through some exercise of public policy. An example of the flip side might be education. If it were sold for profit in a private market, students and parents could be expected to pay for that education which would bring an adequate rate of return through their employment. But who would pay for that education which makes democracy viable or sparks economic development? Those are external benefits which will be lost if not somehow publicly subsidized.

Urban mass transit is a classic case of externalities. If privately provided without public intervention in the market place, transit systems would produce as much transportation as riders would purchase at fares producing sufficient revenues to cover all costs and provide an adequate return to justify remaining in business. However, that would not pay for the use of public roads or for any possible contributions to pollution. More importantly, on the other hand, passengers would ride the buses as long as the fares did not exceed the value received in movement to work, school or recreation. But mass transit may also reduce congestion and pollution by reducing the number of private automobiles on the streets and highways. It offers mobility to those without access to private transportation, including schoolchildren, the poor, the elderly and the handicapped. It may save public investment in highways, give employers access to otherwise untapped labor pools and affect land use patterns in terms of residency and industrial and commercial location. Transit passengers have no reason to pay for those public benefits and society will be deprived of them if some source of public subsidization is not provided.

UTA Revenues

UTA's total revenues (excluding federal capital grants of $8,297,130) for 1986 were $35,464,913. Of that total, $7,139,912 or 20.1 percent was allocated to capital reserves for the purchase of new equipment and facilities (Table 1). The other $28,325,001 covered the operating expenses for the year. Passenger revenues produced a little over $5 million or 14.5 percent of total UTA revenues, a proportion fairly representative of public mass transit systems nationally. In addition, advertising revenues, interest income and special bus revenues brought in another 5.5 percent. The remainder was public subsidy, 13.6 percent from federal operating grants and $23.5 million or 66.5 percent of total revenues emanating from the .25 percent sales tax allocated to UTA.

Table 1
UTA Revenues by Source

	1985	1986
Passenger revenue	$ 5,343,880	$ 5,147,618
Special bus revenue	341,438	337,414
Advertising revenue	171,613	190,451
Sales tax revenue	22,732,446	23,540,501
Federal operating funds	4,717,827	4,830,062
Other income	1,238,693	1,418,867
Total	$34,545,897	$35,464,913

Source: Utah Transit Authority Summary Financial Data (unaudited).

Benefits and Costs of UTA Objectives

Throughout its various actions related to UTA, the Utah State Legislature has announced as the system's objectives:

- Reducing air pollution, congestion and highway use
- Conserving energy and natural resources
- Providing mobility to those with low incomes, handicaps or limited access to automobiles
- Contributing to the social and economic vitality of the services area

Any publicly-subsidized activity merits periodic assessment to see if the public is getting its money's worth. Ideally that assessment would take the form of a cost-benefit analysis, quantifying all costs and benefits to test whether the latter exceeds the former. That approach works well for activities of simple cost and straightforward and easily measured benefit. No one has yet done a successful cost-benefit analysis of any urban public transit system anywhere in the world. Most of the costs are readily identifiable and quantifiable. The benefits are more complex and many of them resist quantification. What can be done is to identify benefits, quantify as many of them as possible, compare those to the costs and then judge qualitatively whether the nonquantified benefits are likely to offset the remaining costs.

At the urging of the Utah Transit Authority, the Bureau of Business and Economic Research at the University of Utah undertook in the summer and fall of 1987, a study of the UTA system's impact on the Utah economy. This article is a summary of a 95-page report with the same title. The operational questions are:

1. To what extent has UTA accomplished its assigned objectives?
2. Has the economic impact of the system been adequate to justify its costs?
3. What does the future portend for mass transit needs in Utah?

User Benefits

The most obvious beneficiaries of UTA's transit services are the bus riders. It is obvious that they would not ride the bus if the benefits they received were not at least equal to the fares they pay. However, it is possible and even likely that for many of them their benefits exceed their costs. During the period for which data were available to this study, the basic fare was 50 cents for peak hours and 40 cents off-peak. Handicapped and senior citizens were charged half-fare. On a monthly pass basis, adult riders paid $18 and minor students, $13. Monthly passes for senior citizens and handicapped cost $13. From this varied structure the average fare cost per ride amounted to 33 cents during 1986.

One straightforward measure of the benefits UTA riders receive is to compare the $5 million spent in fares during 1986 with the cost of making the same trips by other available methods of transportation. In the absence of UTA, those now riding the bus would have to use automobiles, bicycles, walk or stay home. Assuming the former, it is possible to estimate the amount of money saved by bus riders over what automobile ownership and use would have cost.

The Hertz Corporation estimates the cost of automobile ownership at 52 cents per mile. Of course, few Utahns would forego automobile ownership in order to ride the bus. A Stanford Research Institute study in Los Angeles estimated that 10 percent of those riding the buses had chosen not to own an automobile because bus transportation was available. No similar information is available for

Utahns so the SRI study's 10 percent is assumed for illustration. For those who own an automobile, such costs as depreciation, interest, insurance and licensing go on regardless of use. The 21 cents per mile the Internal Revenue Service allows employees to be reimbursed for use of their personal automobile is a reasonable estimate of the cost of driving an automobile, once owned. The average UTA linked passenger trip in 1986 would have required 5.8 miles of automobile travel. Since the average personal vehicle traveling Wasatch Front roads and highways contains 1.54 persons, 58 million personal vehicle miles would have been required to carry the 1986 UTA ridership. If 10 percent of those personal vehicle miles saved 52 cents per mile and the remainder 21 cents per mile, the total savings to users from having the UTA available in 1986 was $13,978,000. Subtracting the $5,177,736 they paid in fares, their net savings was $8,800,264.

Neither of these calculations counts the benefits of reduced driving stress, on-bus leisure and increased safety. But neither are the costs of the walk to and from the bus stops nor the time expenditure of the additional 10 minutes required for the average bus ride counted, compared to an automobile ride of the same distance.

Community Benefits

The fact that local taxpayers pay 66.5 percent of the cost of each bus user's ride points up the importance of assessing the community benefits of the UTA system. Involved is a substantial redistribution of income from taxpayers to transit users. Such redistribution is justified only if there is some special public policy purpose for the income transfer or if the taxpayers get their money's worth in other social benefits. Among the arguments for UTA's initiation were the potentials for greater safety, reduced pollution, congestion, energy absorption, more efficient land use, improved economic development and employment and fairer income distribution. The progress toward each of these objectives to date and their demonstrated future potential can be assessed as a basis for an estimate of the degree to which community benefits exceed community costs.

Safety

Those riding UTA buses experience less risk exposure to automobile accidents than if they traveled the same miles by private automobile. In the UTA service area in 1986, there were 2.1 fatalities, 145 injuries and 1,133 reported property damage accidents for every one hundred million miles traveled. Since UTA reduced private vehicle travel by an estimated 58 million miles, the incidence of accidents was reduced by the numbers indicated in Table 2. The United States Department of Transportation publishes the estimates of the average cost of each automobile accident shown in Table 2. Multiplying the accidents prevented by the average costs per occurrence results in an estimated safety savings of $2,775,863.

Unfortunately, UTA buses are involved in traffic accidents as well (Table 3). In addition, the bus company keeps track of other injury-causing

Table 2
Indirect Safety Effects of UTA

Accident Type	Number, UTA Service Area	Rate[a]	Cost per Occurrence	Number Saved	Cost Saving
Fatality	161	2.1	$503,757	1.25	$ 736,051
Injury	11,141	145.3	18,323	84.31	1,544,629
Property	86,920	1,133.8	753	657.16	495,173
Total					$2,775,853

[a]Per hundred million vehicle miles traveled

Table 3
UTA Accident Rates
(average per year)

Accident Type	Number	Rate[a]	Cost per Occurrence	Total Cost
Property damage	173	1456.43	$ 753	$130,269
PIP[b]	147	1237.55	190	27,966
Bodily injury	29	244.14	18,323	531,367
Fatality	0.33	2.78	503,757	166,240

[a]Per hundred million vehicle miles traveled
[b]Personal injury to passengers, pedestrians and bicyclists

accidents not involving automobiles. On the same basis, the costs of those accidents would be $855,841, leaving a net savings of $1,920,012 per year (Table 4).

Table 4
Net UTA Road Safety Savings, 1986

Savings due to reduced vmt's	$2,775,853
Total UTA accident cost	855,841
Net savings	1,920,012

Energy Conservation

Energy conservation is also a consequence of the reduced vehicle miles traveled as a result of UTA ridership; though, of course, there must be an offset for the fuel use of UTA buses. The 58 million personal vehicle miles estimated to be saved during 1986 by UTA's availability translates into 3.8 million gallons of gasoline. However, UTA traveled 11.3 million miles providing that service, consuming 2.9 million gallons of cheaper priced fuel for a net fuel saving of approximately 900,000 gallons. That consists of about .1 percent of Utah's total motor fuel consumption. Combining the savings from reduced fuel consumption and the replacement by cheaper diesel fuels at 1986 prices resulted in an estimated total fuel cost savings of $865,240. Fuel savings is not as critical to society as it was during the oil shortage era of UTA's birth but that importance may return in the foreseeable future.

Congestion

Congestion reduction is also a consequence of reduced private vehicle miles traveled. Congestion takes its toll in frustration and stress but the most quantifiable cost is delay resulting in time loss, excess fuel use and waste of the overhead of automobile ownership. Of course, buses themselves contribute to congestion, but each bus mile, at present levels of ridership, replaces an average of 11.7 automobile miles. Therefore, because of UTA, approximately 36,000 fewer private vehicle trips were made along the Wasatch Front streets and highways on a daily basis during 1986. Though at most hours the road capacity is sufficient to carry the load, rush hours are more critical.

The Wasatch Front Regional Council estimates that if all of the peak hour commuters now riding UTA buses were commuting by automobile, the increased congestion would slow traffic to the extent that a total of approximately 1,800 hours would be added to commuting time each day on average. The Federal Urban Mass Transit Authority evaluates time saved in commuting to work at $4 per hour on a national basis. If that evaluation is accepted for Utah commuters, they gain a total of $2,628,000 worth of time each year because of UTA availability. That figure will become even more compelling as the years go by; the commuting hours saved by the year

2005, for instance, are estimated at 7,600 hours per day. Reduced congestion has other benefits such as pedestrian convenience and safety and savings in street and highway maintenance, which are less easily quantified. However, system-wide, outside rush hours, the total effect is little noticed.

Economic Impact of Federal Grants

Subsidies from the Urban Mass Transit Administration to the Utah Transit Authority have an impact on the Utah economy that goes beyond the direct wages and salaries paid for out of the grant funds. The overall magnitude of this impact has been analyzed by means of the 120-sector Bureau of Economic and Business Research Input-Output Model of the Utah economy. This model can be used to estimate the indirect and induced impacts of an external stimulus to the Utah economy, such as injection of UMTA grant funds.

Indirect impacts refer to impacts resulting from the purchases of equipment, supplies, materials or services from Utah sources out of grant funds, while induced impacts refer to impacts resulting from direct payments to households out of grant funds or from income generated indirectly out of payments to procure goods and services from Utah vendors.

There are two basic assumptions underlying the analysis of the impact of UMTA grants to the Utah Transit Authority: (1) if the UMTA grants should be withdrawn, they would not be replaced by other federal grants to some other Utah agency (for example, grants to the Utah Department of Transportation for highway construction); and (2) that the allocation of local resources among alternative in-state and out-of-state industrial sectors would not be affected by the withdrawal of federal subsidies to the Utah Transit Authority.

Obviously, other scenarios are conceivable. One might want to consider what the impact would be if UMTA grants were replaced by some other sort of federal subsidies, or what the impact would be if withdrawal of UMTA subsidies were to result in a reallocation of Utah expenditures in such a way as to make an appropriate adjustment to the withdrawal of federal funding. Nevertheless, it should still be instructive to consider the impact of the federal funds under the restricted assumptions that have been specified.

Only that proportion of the federal funds ultimately ending up as income for Utah households and not spent for purchases of materials and services from out-of-state adds to Utah income. That proportion is different for each of the 120 sectors of the Input-Output Model.

The $4,764,170 Federal Operating Assistance and the $8,297,130 Federal Capital Grant received in 1986 were dispersed among the 120 sectors in accordance with the expenditure patterns of that year. It became apparent that approximately $3.5 million of the total was direct income to Utah households which, with an income multiplier of 2.4, had a total impact of more than $8.5 million per year.

Unquantifiable Benefits

To this point, the user and community benefits identified are those which, under reasonable assumptions, can be valued in monetary terms. There are, in addition, a number of benefits which have undoubted value but do not easily lend themselves to quantitative valuation.

Air Pollution

Diminished air pollution is another contribution of UTA's reduction in personal vehicle miles traveled, but one against which must be offset UTA's own pollution impact. The pollutants involved are hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide and nitrous oxide. Buses are such heavy contributors to the emission of hydrocarbons and nitrous oxide that the total pollution of these types are increased by UTA's presence. For carbon monoxide, the most toxic of the three pollutants, the savings from reduced total personal vehicle miles are greater than the bus emissions. Table 5 shows the net result.

UTA's effect is positive, though of small moment, in the total of Wasatch Front particulate emissions. However, the impact would be much more significant in an area of concentrated vehicle and bus traffic such as the central business district. Since the consequences of air pollution are primarily health and aesthetics, it is difficult to put a dollar value on the net savings.

Table 5
Pollution Effect of UTA
(tons)

Emission Type	Total in Area	Amount Saved by UTA	Percent Change
Carbon monoxide	45,154	165.14	-.366
Nitrous oxide	29,969	-135.28	.005
Hydrocarbons	7,348	-231.00	.03

Source: Calculated using statistics from Utah Bureau of Air Quality, 1985 Utah Air Emission Inventory, Department of Health, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1985.

Land Use

The presence of a mass transit system undoubtedly has a major effect on patterns of land use and spatial development along the Wasatch Front. The trouble is with UTA exercising influence in various ways, no one can say what the net effect is. Supporters in the central business district hoped a subsidized public transportation system would help facilitate a centralized focus for industries, offices and stores and their customers and employees. Congestion, it was feared, could only become more intense, adding to time delays and frustration until all of the above decentralized to the suburbs. Since that decentralization had been the pattern for three decades, it was hoped that an urban mass transit system would bring customers and employees to and from downtown expeditiously, comfortably and cheaply, encouraging businesses and the tax base they represented to stay in or return to the central city.

There are currently an estimated 3 million person trips along the Wasatch Front each day. At the population total projected for the Wasatch Front in the year 2010, that figure will become 4.5 million. Work trips are projected to increase from the current 614,000 per day to 930,000 in 2010 A.D. With rush hour traffic so often at a near standstill, the current ingress and egress routes would have to be at least duplicated, a mind-boggling land use problem as well as financial challenge in itself. Clearly, the Wasatch Front's choices are: (1) a duplication of the freeways, (2) a vast expansion of mass transit, or (3) an acceleration of decentralization.

However, just as mass transit can move customers and employees from the suburbs to downtown, it can transport them from their residences to suburban shopping malls and places of employment. The suburbanization of retail trade has been going on for many years, resisting all efforts to increase the attractiveness of downtown shopping. Similarly, manufacturing has responded to centrifugal forces. Now, despite substantial central city vacancy rates, office complexes are sprouting throughout the valley. Suburban businesses and property owners make the same demands for mass transit service as do their central business district counterparts. The net impact of mass transit on these trends is impossible to measure. However, it is clear that viable central business districts for the major cities along the Wasatch Front and especially in Salt Lake City depend upon continued expansion in mass transit availability and use.

Most Wasatch Front communities emerged and took essential shape before the advent of mass transit and are not well-patterned from that vantage-point. That cannot be changed. But UTA's participation with the Wasatch Front Regional Council in planning for the area's future promises more rational land use as communities develop and change.

Economic Development and Employment

One of the characteristics always looked for among the infrastructure criteria assessed by businesses seeking locations is an efficient mass transit system. New employers want assurance that an eager workforce will be able to move expeditiously and cheaply from their residences to the new places of employment. Existing employers are constantly on the lookout for new labor pools to tap to restrain wage increases and assure plentiful applicants. With the presumption that the lower the family income, the less likely the availability of private transportation, mass transit should increase availability of lower cost labor for employers. In

the process low income groups are provided greater opportunity, but better rewarded employees face increased competition.

Consumer service businesses are also more likely to expand and prosper if customers can get to their doors conveniently and at low cost. However, despite all of these reasonable expectations, there is no way to prove that it has happened and, therefore, no way to project those impacts into the future. All that can be said for certain is that, without mass transit, there are imminent growth restraints on activities of limited access such as the ski resorts of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons and the central business district of at least Salt Lake City.

Equity, Mobility and Income Distribution

An objective established for UTA from its beginning has been the provision of transportation services to the aged, the handicapped, those of low income and others without adequate access to alternative forms of transportation. It was assumed that a redistribution of incomes from the richer to the poorer would be involved. The special fares and passes for senior citizens and handicapped, and the soon-to-be inaugurated Flextran Service for the seriously handicapped are indicators of progress toward the mobility objective. Redistribution is not so clear.

There is no question but what the average household income of UTA riders is below that of the average Wasatch Front household. Whereas the median household income along the Wasatch Front was $30,850 in 1986, 55 percent of UTA riders in 1986 were from households having earned incomes of less than $15,000 (Table 6). However, the sales tax which produces 66.5 percent of UTA revenues also has regressive incidence, with those households having incomes below $15,000 on the average paying .40 percent of their income to support UTA, compared to .19 percent for the $15,000-$25,000 group and .12 percent of households with incomes between $23,000 and $50,000. The incidence rises again for the open-ended over-$50,000 income class who pay .17 percent of their incomes to the UTA sales tax (Table 7). On an aggregate basis, those with incomes above $25,000 produced 51 percent of the UTA sales tax income in 1986. The households with incomes above $50,000 (5%) paid 20 percent of the total tax, while the households with incomes below $15,000 (29%) paid 29 percent. Those with incomes between $15,000 and $25,000 (34%) came off best in this sense, providing 20 percent of the UTA sales tax revenues. The households with

Table 6
Income Distribution of UTA Area and UTA Riders
(1985)

Household Income Class (000)	Number of UTA Riders	Percent of UTA Riders in Income Class	UTA Area Population	Percent of UTA Area Population in Income Class	Riders as Percent of Population Class
Under $15	17,572	55	369,909	29	4.8
$15-25	5,973	19	403,120	32	1.5
$25-50	6,790	21	404,616	32	1.7
Over $50	1,365	4	71,437	6	1.9

Source: Ridership data from Wasatch Front Regional Council, "Analysis of 1985 Onboard Survey, 1986." UTA area population data projected on the basis of 1980 Census of Population data.

Table 7
Distribution of UTA Sales Tax Burden
(1986)

Income Class (000)	Total Income of Class	Total Sales Tax Paid	UTA Sales Tax as Percent of Total Income of Class
Under $15	$1,608,205,754	$147,465,365	.40
$15-$25	2,329,895,820	102,857,858	.19
$25-$50	5,673,912,070	158,400,080	.12
Over $50	2,665,489,268	102,244,697	.17

Source: Calculated using figures from the "Tax Burden Report," Bryant Howe, Office of Legislative Research, 1987.

incomes between $25,000 and $50,000 (32%) paid 31 percent of the total. The modest redistribution in favor of those with lower incomes is in marked contrast to the San Francisco Bay Area where the transit system, BART, clearly involves a subsidy to higher income households at the expense of those with low incomes.

What Does It All Add Up to?

Transit users spent about $5.2 million per year in bus fares during 1986, along with some extra commuting time, to benefit to the extent of $14 million in automobile cost savings. Clearly, UTA has been a boon to its users. But why is the usage not heavier? The time loss and the decreased autonomy of the private automobile driver are apparently worth even more to the rest.

However, taxpayers, most of whom never set foot or posterior on a bus, pay out $23.5 million per year in sales taxes (1986) to subsidize those who do. Since the sales tax is a generally regressive tax, the burden falls on those least able to pay. Nevertheless, the fact that bus riders also tend to be drawn from the lower end of the income scale prevents a major redistribution from the poor to the rich through the sales tax subsidy. The net result is apparently to leave the existing income distribution little disturbed. However, the taxpayers represent the community at large and raise the question, "What public benefits justify this $23.5 million annual public expenditure?"

If the estimates of this study are correct, the community receives back a savings in accident costs of about $1.9 million per year. Some $865,000 per year is saved in fuel costs which would otherwise have been paid for largely by the same people who now ride the buses. That savings would be a significant community benefit only if gasoline were in short supply. There is a small net reduction in air pollution but no means for quantifying those benefits. Automobile commuters gained $2.6 million in time saved by the reduced congestion.

The quantifiable community benefits are:

Safety	$ 1,920,012
Energy Conservation	865,240
Commuter Time Saving	2,628,008
Federal Grant Impact	8,500,000
Total	$13,913,252

The total community benefit figure offsets 59.2 percent of the $23.5 million sales tax subsidy to UTA riders. In addition, non-quantifiable benefits are evident in the reduction of congestion, promotion of economic development, redistribution of income and the mobility of the economically disadvantaged and those without automobile access. There has been little net impact on land use to date but that will

increase in the future with unpredictable results. Other positive impacts on economic development and employment appear reasonable but unprovable. All that is clear for congestion, land use and economic development is that the central business district of at least Salt Lake City and some of the area ski resorts cannot maintain themselves, let alone expand over time, without increased reliance on mass transit.

Quantifiable community benefits offset three-fifths of the community cost. It is a political judgment that the surplus gains to the riders plus the non-quantifiable benefits are at least equal to the remaining costs. Since the transit system is in place with its initial cost already paid, both user and community benefits can only rise as ridership increases. The most important order of business for urban mass transit in Utah appears to be finding ways to increase utilization. UTA has been aggressive in that pursuit throughout its short history but has yet to find the magic formula.

Utah Business Statistics

UTAH DATA	Oct. 1986	Oct. 1987	% Change From Year Ago	12 Month Average This Year	12 Month Average Last Year	12 Month Average % Change
Total Personal Income (seasonally adjusted) (mil. of dol.) (qtly.)	18,342	NA	NA	NA	18,206.7	NA
New Corporations (no.)	434	474	9.2%	459	470	-2.3%
New Car, Truck and Motorhome Sales (no.)	5,478	NA	NA	NA	6,268.8	-19.1%
Agriculture						
Average Prices Recorded by Farmers (dol.)						
Beef Steers and Heifers (cwt) (thous.)	56.00	63.80	13.9%	62.58	55.19	13.4%
Lambs (cwt)	63.80	69.50	8.9%	72.41	64.23	12.7%
Milk Wholesale (cwt)	12.60	12.10	-4.0%	12.03	11.74	2.4%
Alfalfa Hay, Baled (per ton)	61.00	69.00	13.1%	66.33	69.39	-4.4%
Cattle Slaughtered (live weight) (thous. of lbs.)	40,104	43,449	8.3%	41,052	36,272	13.2%
Construction						
Total Construction (thous. of dol.) [1]	144,475	148,262	2.6%	123,255	126,453	-2.5%
Residential	67,764	49,503	-26.9%	55,030	58,365	-5.7%
Nonresidential	64,230	66,950	4.2%	37,554	48,585	-22.7%
Public Works and Utilities	12,481	31,809	154.9%	30,671	19,753	55.3%
Total Permit Construction (thous. of dol.) [2]	99,717.7	83,013.6	-16.7%	93,391.4	111,364.9	-16.1%
Residential	63,123.3	37,293.5	-40.9%	43,607.5	59,216.7	-26.4%
Nonresidential	25,424.6	41,856.2	64.6%	36,020.6	38,309.2	-6.0%
Additions, Alterations and Repairs	11,169.9	13,863.9	24.1%	13,763.3	13,859.6	-0.7%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	903	495	-45.2%	670	1,120	-40.2%
Employment						
Civilian Labor Force (thous.)	762.6	755.4	-0.9%	758.3	751.1	1.0%
Total Employed Persons	721.2	716.0	-0.7%	709.8	707.9	0.3%
Unemployed Persons	41.4	39.3	-5.1%	48.5	42.8	13.3%
Percent Total Labor Force	5.4	5.2	-3.7%	6.4	5.7	12.8%
Employees on Nonagricultural Payrolls (thous. of jobs)	640.1	647.4	1.1%	640.4	634.7	0.9%
Manufacturing	91.3	94.3	3.3%	92.2	92.5	-0.4%
Mining	7.6	8.3	9.2%	8.2	8.1	0.1%
Contract Construction	33.0	27.5	-16.7%	28.5	33.8	-15.6%
Transportaion, Communication and Utilities	37.4	38.4	2.7%	37.7	37.2	1.4%
Wholesale Trade	36.2	36.2	0.0%	36.3	35.9	1.2%
Retail Trade	117.8	118.7	0.8%	119.1	116.3	2.4%
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	33.1	33.6	1.5%	33.7	32.7	3.1%
Services [3]	141.3	148.5	5.1%	143.1	137.2	4.3%
Federal Government	39.9	39.0	-2.3%	40.0	40.4	-1.0%
State Government [4]	37.8	37.3	-1.3%	37.3	37.7	-1.0%
Local Government [4]	64.4	65.6	1.9%	64.4	63.0	2.3%
Average Weekly Hours						
Manufacturing	40.2	39.8	-1.0%	39.7	40.4	-1.8%
Mining	41.2	39.9	-3.2%	42.0	43.0	-2.5%
Wholesale Trade	36.8	38.9	5.7%	38.4	36.3	5.8%
Retail Trade	27.8	27.8	0.0%	28.4	28.0	1.4%
Amount of Unemployment Compensation (thous. of dol.)	6,560.3	4,809.0	-26.7%	8,535.7	8,015.2	6.5%
Finance						
Savings, Savings and Loan Association (mil. of dol.)	2,417.4	2,474.8	2.4%	2,447.3	2,352.1	4.0%
Tax Collections by the State of Utah (thous. of dol.)						
Total Tax Collections	65,100.6	85,901.9	32.0%	135,624.4	124,355.4	9.1%
Sales and Use Tax	12,928.3	19,065.1	47.5%	47,469.6	45,247.1	4.9%
Motor Fuel Tax	9,254.8	12,471.1	34.8%	8,801.3	7,675.1	14.7%
Individual Income Tax	23,634.1	26,109.5	10.5%	47,120.1	38,475.2	22.5%
Corporation Franchise Tax	4,627.8	9,687.8	109.3%	6,247.4	5,012.3	24.6%
Production						
Net Electric Power Utilized (mil. of kwh)	1,024.1	NA	NA	NA	1,104.1	NA
Crude Oil to Refineries (thous. of bbls.)	4,286.8	3,735.5	-12.9%	3,823.1	3,721.6	2.7%
Crude Oil (thous. of bbls.)	3,136.9	3,047.2	-2.9%	2,999.9	3,319.4	-9.6%
Natural Gas (mil. of cu. ft.)	20,313.0	25,011.8	23.1%	21,315.0	19,180.8	11.1%
Coal (thous. short tons)	840.0	1,713.0	103.9%	1,130.6	1,009.3	12.0%
Tourism/Travel						
Air Passengers (total no. on and off) (S.L. Int'l Airport)	766,624	767,093	0.1%	842,657	819,351	2.8%
Highway Traffic Count Across State Lines	37,187	37,185	-0.0%	38,071	36,276	4.9%
Transient Room Taxes (thous. of dol.)	207.9	248.3	19.4%	457.7	425.5	7.6%
Visits, State, Nat'l. Parks, Monuments (thous.)	797.2	890.7	11.7%	1,057.5	1,013.0	4.4%
Utilities						
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell) (Residential)	477,003	483,603	1.4%	478,752	470,756	1.7%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential)	170,836	177,961	4.2%	174,760	167,799	4.2%
Electric Customers (Residential)	464,446	473,304	1.9%	471,796	NA	NA
Electric Customers (Commercial)	45,274	45,937	1.5%	46,129	NA	NA
Natural Gas Customers (Residential & Commercial)	434,658	443,530	2.0%	445,068	433,577	2.7%
Natural Gas Customers (Industrial)	572	553	-3.3%	557	568	-2.0%

Utah Business Statistics

UTAH DATA	Oct. 1986	Oct. 1987	% Change From Year Ago	12 Month Average This Year	12 Month Average Last Year	12 Month Average % Change
Davis County						
Non-Ag. Employment (thous.)	53.4r	53.0fo	-0.7%	53.3	53.4	-0.2%
Unemployment Rate	4.5r	4.5	0.0%	5.3	4.3	23.3%
Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	14,193.9	7,806	-45.0%	12,767	15,783	-19.1%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	137	79	-42.3%	97	126	-23.0%
Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.)	367.3	335	-8.7%	NA	329	NA
Electric Customers (Residential)	45,874	47,69	4.0%	47,041	43,801	8.4%
Electric Customers (Commercial)	3,187	3,304	3.7%	3,256	3,048	6.7%
Natural Gas Customers (Residential)	46,538	48,645	4.5%	48,537	45,941	5.6%
Natural Gas Customers (Industrial)	51	52	2.0%	52	50	3.2%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential)	53,799	54,468	1.2%	54,708	52,293	4.6%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential)	10,350	10,681	3.2%	10,467	10,041	4.2%
Salt Lake County						
Non-Ag. Employment (thous.)	333.5r	333.5fo	0.0%	334.9	329.3	1.7%
Unemployment Rate	4.9r	4.7	-4.1%	5.5	5.5	0.0%
Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	48,614.3	45,160.8	-7.1%	44,471.1	68,719.1	-35.3%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	400	185	-53.8%	266	576	-53.7%
Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.)	7,432.2	6,957	-6.4%	7,180	7,275	-1.3%
Electric Customers (Residential)	232,440	237,181	2.0%	235,770	230,420	2.3%
Electric Customers (Commercial)	19,411	20,027	3.2%	19,834	19,204	3.3%
Natural Gas Customers (Residential)	211,800	214,561	1.3%	216,835	211,621	2.5%
Natural Gas Customers (Industrial)	254	235	-7.5%	243	257	-5.6%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential)	224,537	228,297	1.7%	226,220	221,775	2.0%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential)	108,525	110,594	1.9%	109,679	107,650	1.9%
Utah County						
Non-Ag. Employment (thous.)	74.5r	74.5fo	0.0%	72.2	72.3	-0.1%
Unemployment Rate	6.0r	5.1	-15.0%	7.3	6.3	15.9%
Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	9,003.5	14,046.7	56.0%	12,573.1	9,503.4	44.9%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	116	78	-32.8%	93	120	-22.5%
Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.)	923.0	948	2.7%	932	913	2.0%
Electric Customers (Residential)	49,983	51,470	3.0%	51,829	NA	NA
Electric Customers (Commercial)	6,175	5,856	-5.2%	6,336	NA	NA
Natural Gas Customers (Residential)	59,730	59,952	0.4%	60,192	59,461	1.2%
Natural Gas Customers (Industrial)	72	69	-4.2%	71	71	0.0%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential)	64,439	64,122	-0.5%	62,336	60,124	3.7%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential)	16,209	19,347	19.4%	18,219	15,741	15.8%
Weber County						
Non-Ag. Employment (thous.)	59.9r	60.4fo	0.8%	60.4	59.4	1.8%
Unemployment Rate	5.9r	6.1	3.4%	7.1	6.0	17.4%
Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	8,781.7	9,923.4	13.0%	8,460.1	9,066.1	-6.7%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	72	55	-23.6%	69	80	-13.3%
Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.)	600.7	563.1	-6.3%	615.5	614.5	0.2%
Electric Customers (Residential)	52,000	52,885	1.7%	52,702	51,620	2.1%
Electric Customers (Commercial)	4,731	4,906	3.7%	4,830	4,727	2.2%
Natural Gas Customers (Residential)	47,974	48,590	1.3%	48,907	47,633	2.7%
Natural Gas Customers (Industrial)	87	86	-1.1%	85	87	-2.3%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential)	45,541	46,048	1.2%	45,862	45,368	1.1%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential)	10,624	11,300	6.4%	10,902	10,563	3.2%

r Revised na Not available fo Forecast

Sources:

Personal Income:	Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce
New Corporations:	Utah Secretary of State
New Car and Truck Sales:	Utah State Tax Commission, Economic and Statistical Unit
Agriculture:	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture, Utah: Utah Crop and Livestock Reporting Service
Construction Data:	F.W. Dodge Statistics and Utah Construction Report, Bureau of Economic and Business Research
Employment Data:	Utah Department of Employment Security
Savings Information:	Utah Savings and Loan Institutions
Tax Collections:	Utah State Tax Commission
Net Electric Power Utilized:	Cooperating Utah power companies
Crude Oil Production:	Area oil refineries
Natural Gas Production:	Utah Department of Oil, Gas, and Mining
Coal Production:	U.S. Department of Energy
Air Passengers:	Salt Lake City International Airport, Statistics Division
Highway Traffic Count:	Utah Department of Transportation
Visits to State and National Parks and Monuments:	U. S. Forest Service, Utah State Parks and Recreation Department
Utilities Data:	Cooperating Utah utility companies
Postal Receipts:	Postmasters in Davis, Salt Lake, Utah, and Weber Counties

Footnotes:

1 Obtained from F.W. Dodge Statistics
2 Obtained from Utah Construction Report
3 Includes service, nonprofit and religious institutions
4 Includes public schools and college institutions

Utah Business Statistics

UTAH DATA	Nov. 1986	Nov. 1987	% Change From Year Ago	12 Month Average This Year	12 Month Average Last Year	12 Month Average % Change
Total Personal Income (seasonally adjusted) (mil. of dol.) (qtly.)	18,342	NA	NA	NA	18,247.3	NA
New Corporations (no.)	338	397	17.5%	464	463	0.3%
New Car, Truck and Motorhome Sales (no.)	5,037	NA	NA	NA	6,204.8	-19.1%
Agriculture						
Average Prices Recorded by Farmers (dol.)						
Beef Steers and Heifers (cwt) (thous.)	58.00	64.00	10.3%	63.08	55.06	14.6%
Lambs (cwt)	68.30	68.80	0.7%	72.45	65.03	11.4%
Milk Wholesale (cwt)	12.80	12.20	-4.7%	11.98	11.80	1.5%
Alfalfa Hay, Baled (per ton)	65.00	70.00	7.7%	66.75	69.06	-3.3%
Cattle Slaughtered (live weight) (thous. of lbs.)	35,171	39,962	13.6%	41,451	36,384	13.9%
Construction						
Total Construction (thous. of dol.) [1]	103,660	74,668	-28.0%	120,839	127,483	-5.2%
Residential	58,637	40,507	-30.9%	53,519	59,668	-10.3%
Nonresidential	29,479	22,441	-23.9%	36,967	47,275	-21.8%
Public Works and Utilities	15,544	11,720	-24.6%	30,353	20,790	46.0%
Total Permit Construction (thous. of dol.) [2]	73,615.3	90,238.9	22.6%	94,776.7	109,205.9	-13.2%
Residential	39,579.6	29,109.2	-26.5%	42,735.0	58,937.9	-27.5%
Nonresidential	23,461.8	48,999.1	108.8%	36,148.7	36,641.8	4.1%
Additions, Alterations and Repairs	10,573.8	12,130.6	14.7%	13,893.0	13,646.7	1.8%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	762	413	-45.8%	641	1,113	-42.4%
Employment						
Civilian Labor Force (thous.)	757.3	761.0	0.5%	758.6	748.6	1.3%
Total Employed Persons	714.4	719.2	0.7%	710.2	705.8	0.6%
Unemployed Persons	42.8	41.9	-2.1%	48.5	42.4	14.4%
Percent Total Labor Force	5.7	5.5	-3.5%	6.4	5.7	13.1%
Employees on Nonagricultural Payrolls (thous. of jobs)	643.6	650.1	1.0%	641.0	635.3	0.9%
Manufacturing	91.1	94.6	3.8%	92.5	92.2	0.4%
Mining	7.8	8.4	7.7%	8.2	8.0	2.0%
Contract Construction	31.5	26.4	-16.2%	28.0	33.3	-15.7%
Transportaion, Communication and Utilities	37.7	38.6	2.4%	37.8	37.3	1.3%
Wholesale Trade	36.1	35.9	-0.6%	36.3	35.9	1.1%
Retail Trade	121.1	120.8	-0.2%	119.1	116.6	2.1%
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	33.1	33.7	1.8%	33.7	32.8	2.8%
Services [3]	141.1	148.5	5.2%	143.7	137.9	4.2%
Federal Government	39.7	39.3	-1.0%	39.9	40.4	-1.1%
State Government [4]	39.0	38.3	-1.8%	37.3	37.9	-1.6%
Local Government [4]	64.9	65.7	1.2%	64.5	63.0	2.4%
Average Weekly Hours						
Manufacturing	40.4	41.5	2.7%	39.8	40.4	-1.4%
Mining	43.3	40.8	-5.8%	41.7	42.9	-2.6%
Wholesale Trade	35.8	38.4	7.3%	38.6	36.4	6.3%
Retail Trade	28.3	27.7	-2.1%	28.4	28.0	1.2%
Amount of Unemployment Compensation (thous. of dol.)	9,295.2	4,697.0	-49.5%	8,152.5	8,326.2	-2.1%
Finance						
Savings, Savings and Loan Association (mil. of dol.)	2,409.9	2,475.9	2.7%	2,452.8	2,386.5	2.8%
Tax Collections by the State of Utah (thous. of dol.)						
Total Tax Collections	241,246.5	272,882.3	13.1%	138,260.7	124,448.2	11.1%
Sales and Use Tax	129,345.4	131,810.9	1.9%	47,674.3	45,960.7	3.7%
Motor Fuel Tax	4,332.6	9,748.5	125.0%	9,252.7	7,721.6	19.8%
Individual Income Tax	64,537.4	81,297.9	26.0%	48,516.9	38,641.3	25.6%
Corporation Franchise Tax	511.2	835.4	63.4%	6,274.4	4,799.8	30.7%
Production						
Net Electric Power Utilized (mil. of kwh)	1,061.3	NA	NA	NA	1,038.3	NA
Crude Oil to Refineries (thous. of bbls.)	4,145.4	3,952.5	-4.7%	3,807.0	3,765.8	1.1%
Crude Oil (thous. of bbls.)	3,169.1	2,859.7	-9.8%	2,974.1	3,292.9	-9.7%
Natural Gas (mil. of cu. ft.)	21,683.2	24,208.9	11.6%	21,525.5	19,340.7	11.3%
Coal (thous. short tons)	783.0	1,513.0	93.2%	1,191.4	982.6	21.3%
Tourism/Travel						
Air Passengers (total no. on and off) (S.L. Int'l Airport)	709,324	723,509	2.0%	843,639	827,957	1.9%
Highway Traffic Count Across State Lines	32,191	NA	NA	NA	36,674	NA
Transient Room Taxes (thous. of dol.)	1,109.7	1861.8	67.8%	520.4	378.7	37.4%
Visits, State, Nat'l. Parks, Monuments (thous.)	317.9	359.9	13.2%	1,061.0	1,014.4	4.6%
Utilities						
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell) (Residential)	477,530	484,272	1.4%	479,314	471,512	1.7%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential)	171,048	177,709	3.9%	175,315	168,218	4.2%
Electric Customers (Residential)	466,676	474,256	1.6%	472,427	460,398	2.6%
Electric Customers (Commercial)	45,206	46,171	2.1%	46,209	45,046	2.6%
Natural Gas Customers (Residential & Commercial)	439,183	448,057	2.0%	445,808	434,772	2.5%
Natural Gas Customers (Industrial)	570	550	-3.5%	555	567	-2.3%

Utah Business Statistics

UTAH DATA	Nov. 1986	Nov. 1987	% Change From Year Ago	12 Month Average This Year	12 Month Average Last Year	12 Month Average % Change
Davis County						
Non-Ag. Employment (thous.)	52.9r	53.0fo	0.2%	53.3	53.5	-0.4%
Unemployment Rate	4.5r	4.8	6.7%	5.3	4.4	21.6%
Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	9,360.1	9,151.4	-2.2%	12,768.4	14,523.9	-12.1%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	93	59	-36.6%	94.3	189.6	-50.3%
Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.)	NA	282	NA	NA	NA	NA
Electric Customers (Residential)	46,075	47,613	3.8%	47,185	44,067	7.1%
Electric Customers (Commercial)	3,176	3,309	4.2%	3,277	3,208	2.1%
Natural Gas Customers (Residential)	47,202	49,216	4.3%	48,704	46,148	5.5%
Natural Gas Customers (Industrial)	51	52	2.0%	52	50	3.0%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential)	53,923	54,511	1.1%	54,757	52,554	4.2%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential)	10,197	10,722	5.1%	10,510	10,074	4.3%
Salt Lake County						
Non-Ag. Employment (thous.)	336.4r	341.2fo	1.4%	335.3	329.6	1.7%
Unemployment Rate	4.8r	5.0	4.2%	5.5	5.4	2.5%
Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	32,171.4	54,022.2	67.9%	46,292.0	58,499.1	-20.9%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	355	152	-57.2%	251	568	-55.8%
Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.)	7,444.6	8,996	20.8%	7,309	7,145	2.3%
Electric Customers (Residential)	233,141	237,634	1.9%	236,145	231,033	2.2%
Electric Customers (Commercial)	19,328	20,169	4.4%	19,905	19,253	3.4%
Natural Gas Customers (Residential)	214,151	215,853	0.8%	216,977	212,231	2.2%
Natural Gas Customers (Industrial)	253	235	-7.1%	241	256	-5.9%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential)	224,798	228,513	1.7%	226,529	222,190	2.0%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential)	109,246	110,054	0.7%	109,746	107,760	1.8%
Utah County						
Non-Ag. Employment (thous.)	75.0r	76.7fo	2.3%	72.4	72.3	0.0%
Unemployment Rate	6.6r	5.3	-19.7%	7.2	6.3	14.2%
Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	9,582.8	8,108.8	-15.4%	12,450.3	8,861.6	40.5%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	82	77	-6.1%	92.9	101.8	-8.8%
Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.)	955.9	923	-3.5%	929	916	1.4%
Electric Customers (Residential)	50,278	51,386	2.2%	51,922	49,688	4.5%
Electric Customers (Commercial)	6,206	5,856	-5.6%	6,309	6,091	3.6%
Natural Gas Customers (Residential)	60,253	60,626	0.6%	60,223	59,592	1.1%
Natural Gas Customers (Industrial)	71	69	-2.8%	71	71	-0.9%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential)	64,164	64,250	0.1%	62,345	62,232	0.2%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential)	16,128	19,509	21.0%	18,521	15,821	17.1%
Weber County						
Non-Ag. Employment (thous.)	60.7r	61.5fo	1.3%	60.5	59.6	1.4%
Unemployment Rate	5.1r	6.6	8.2%	7.1	6.1	17.6%
Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	5,971.0	6,264.8	4.9%	8,484.6	9,077.9	-6.5%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	53	47	-11.3%	69	81	-15.0%
Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.)	648.0	583.6	-9.9%	610.2	619.0	-1.4%
Electric Customers (Residential)	52,384	53,090	1.3%	52,761	51,731	2.0%
Electric Customers (Commercial)	4,764	4,877	2.4%	4,833	4,736	2.2%
Natural Gas Customers (Residential)	48,299	48,891	1.2%	48,956	47,934	2.1%
Natural Gas Customers (Industrial)	86	85	-1.2%	85	87	-2.1%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential)	45,241	46,043	1.8%	45,929	45,309	1.2%
Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential)	10,567	11,288	6.8%	10,962	10,563	3.8%

r Revised na Not available fo Forecast

Sources:

Personal Income:	Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce
New Corporations:	Utah Secretary of State
New Car and Truck Sales:	Utah State Tax Commission, Economic and Statistical Unit
Agriculture:	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture, Utah; Utah Crop and Livestock Reporting Service
Construction Data:	F.W. Dodge Statistics and Utah Construction Report, Bureau of Economic and Business Research
Employment Data:	Utah Department of Employment Security
Savings Information:	Utah Savings and Loan Institutions
Tax Collections:	Utah State Tax Commission
Net Electric Power Utilized:	Cooperating Utah power companies
Crude Oil Production:	Area oil refineries
Natural Gas Production:	Utah Department of Oil, Gas, and Mining
Coal Production:	U.S. Department of Energy
Air Passengers:	Salt Lake City International Airport, Statistics Division
Highway Traffic Count:	Utah Department of Transportation
Visits to State and National Parks and Monuments:	U. S. Forest Service, Utah State Parks and Recreation Department
Utilities Data:	Cooperating Utah utility companies
Postal Receipts:	Postmasters in Davis, Salt Lake, Utah, and Weber Counties

Footnotes:

1 Obtained from F.W. Dodge Statistics
2 Obtained from Utah Construction Report
3 Includes services by nonprofit and religious institutions
4 Includes public schools and college institutions

NATIONAL DATA	Oct. 1986	Oct. 1987	% Change From Year Ago	12 Month Average This Year	12 Month Average Last Year	12 Month Average % Change
U.S. Gross National Product (seasonally adjusted) (bil.) (qtly.)	4,258.7	4,598.0p	8.0%	4,428.8	4,195.6	5.6%
Total Personal Income (seasonally adjusted) (bil. of dol.)	3,577.5	3,853.8	7.7%	3,704.3	3,503.8	5.7%
Industrial Production Indexes (seasonally adjusted) (1977=100)	125.3	132.5	5.7%	128.6	124.9	3.0%
Total Non-Farm Bus. Expend. on New Plants & Equip. (bil.) (qtly.)	386.0	417.2	8.1%	385.3	380.9	1.2%
Index of Leading Indicators (1967=100)	181.2	193.3	6.7%	188.9	177.2	6.6%
Price Indexes						
Consumer Price Indexes (not seasonally adjusted) (1967=100)						
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) All Items	330.5	345.3	4.5%	337.8	327.7	3.1%
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Food & Beverages	315.6	326.9	3.6%	322.7	317.3	1.7%
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Housing	363.0	375.2	3.4%	368.8	359.1	2.7%
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Transportation	302.6	321.9	6.4%	313.7	313.5	0.1%
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Medical Care	442.3	469.8	6.2%	457.8	428.2	6.9%
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Energy	348.6	376.7	8.1%	366.7	384.2	-4.6%
Producer Price Index (not seasonally adjusted) (1967=100)						
Producer Price Index, All Finished Goods	290.5	298.2	2.7%	294.6	290.8	1.3%
GNP Price Deflator (1982=100) (qtly.)	114.9	118.7	3.3%	116.8	113.6	2.8%
Civilian Employment (seasonally adjusted)						
Total Civilian Labor Force (mil.)	118.4	120.3	1.6%	119.4	117.4	1.7%
Total Civilian Employment (mil.)	110.2	113.2	2.7%	111.9	109.2	2.5%
Unemployment Rate	6.9	6.0	-13.0%	6.4	7.0	-9.5%
Construction						
Total Construction (mil. of dol.)	21,076.2	22,492.4	6.7%	20,649.5	18,933.3	9.1%
Residential	10,636.0	10,124.2	-4.8%	9,741.3	9,406.4	3.6%
Nonresidential	7,123.7	8,573.1	20.3%	7,077.6	6,205.3	14.1%
Non-Building	3,316.5	3,795.1	14.4%	3,805.6	3,321.5	14.6%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	144,441	125,645	-13.0%	130,003	139,932	-7.1%
Interest Rates						
Short Term (3 month Treasury bill rate)	5.18	6.40	23.6%	5.76	6.26	-7.9%
Long Term (30-year Treasury bond yields)	8.04	9.61	19.5%	8.42	8.49	-0.9%
Prime Rates Charged by Banks on Short-term Business Loans (ave.)	7.50	9.07	20.9%	7.99	8.67	-7.8%
Mortgage Rates (new homes)	9.57	8.86	-7.4%	9.03	10.01	-9.8%

p Preliminary

Sources: Business Conditions Digest, U.S. Department of Commerce: U.S. Gross National Product, Total National Personal Income, Industrial Production Indexes, Total Business Expenditures for New Plant and Equipment, Index of Leading Indicators, GNP Price Deflator, National Employment Data, Interest Rates.

F.W. Dodge Report, McGraw-Hill: National Construction Data.

Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce: New Home Mortgage Rates.

Utah Labor Market Report, Utah Department of Employment Security: Consumer Price Indexes, Producer Price Indexes.

Bureau of Economic and Business Research
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Return Postage Guaranteed
(Non-Profit Organization)

SRI ACQUISITION
CONGRESSIONAL
INFORMATION SERVICE, INC.
4520 EAST WEST HIGHWAY
BETHESDA, MARYLAND 20814

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage Paid

Permit No. 1529
Salt Lake City, Utah

NATIONAL DATA	Nov. 1986	Nov. 1987	% Change From Year Ago	12 Month Average This Year	12 Month Average Last Year	12 Month Average % Change
U.S. Gross National Product (seasonally adjusted) (bil.) (qtly.)	4,258.7	4,598.0p	8.0%	4,457.1	4,208.5	5.9%
Total Personal Income (seasonally adjusted) (bil. of dol.)	3,590.3	3,936.0	9.6%	3,733.1	3,520.1	6.1%
Industrial Production Indexes (seasonally adjusted) (1977=100)	125.7	133.1	5.9%	129.2	125.0	3.4%
Total Non-Farm Bus. Expend. on New Plants & Equip. (bil.) (qtly.)	386.0	417.2	8.1%	387.9	380.2	2.0%
Index of Leading Indicators (1967=100)	182.7	191.0	4.5%	189.6	178.2	6.4%
Price Indexes						
Consumer Price Indexes (not seasonally adjusted) (1967=100)						
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) All Items	330.8	345.8	4.5%	339.1	328.1	3.4%
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Food & Beverages	316.4	326.7	3.3%	323.6	318.4	1.6%
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Housing	361.7	374.9	3.6%	369.9	359.7	2.8%
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Transportation	304.3	324.1	6.5%	315.3	311.9	1.1%
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Medical Care	444.6	471.7	6.1%	460.1	430.8	6.8%
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Energy	341.7	373.5	9.3%	369.4	377.3	-2.1%
Producer Price Index (not seasonally adjusted) (1967=100)						
Producer Price Index, All Finished Goods	290.7	298.1	2.5%	295.2	290.3	1.7%
GNP Price Deflator (1982=100) (qtly.)	114.9	118.7p	3.3%	117.1	113.8	2.9%
Civilian Employment (seasonally adjusted)						
Total Civilian Labor Force (mil.)	118.6	120.5	1.6%	119.6	117.6	1.7%
Total Civilian Employment (mil.)	110.4	113.5	2.8%	112.1	109.4	2.5%
Unemployment Rate	6.9	5.9	-14.5%	6.3	7.0	-10.6%
Construction						
Total Construction (mil. of dol.)	17,367.1	17,929.7	3.2%	20,696.4	18,953.8	9.2%
Residential	8,360.9	8,229.2	-1.6%	9,730.3	9,435.2	3.1%
Nonresidential	6,624.1	6,966.6	5.2%	7,106.2	6,240.0	13.9%
Non-Building	2,382.1	2,733.9	14.8%	3,835.0	3,278.6	17.0%
New Dwelling Units (no.)	122,277	104,974	-14.2%	128,561	139,294	-7.7%
Interest Rates						
Short Term (3-month Treasury bill rate)	5.35	5.81	8.6%	5.80	6.10	-5.0%
Long Term (30-year Treasury bond yields)	7.81	8.99	15.1%	8.51	8.31	2.5%
Prime Rates Charged by Banks on Short-term Business Loans (ave.)	7.50	8.78	17.1%	8.10	8.50	-4.7%
Mortgage Rates (new homes)	9.45	8.92	-5.6%	8.98	9.92	-9.4%

p Preliminary

Sources: Business Conditions Digest, U.S. Department of Commerce: U.S. Gross National Product, Total National Personal Income, Industrial Production Indexes, Total Business Expenditures for New Plant and Equipment, Index of Leading Indicators, GNP Price Deflator, National Employment Data, Interest Rates.

F.W. Dodge Report, McGraw-Hill: National Construction Data.

Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce: New Home Mortgage Rates.

Utah Labor Market Report, Utah Department of Employment Security: Consumer Price Indexes, Producer Price Indexes.

Chase N. Peterson, *President, University of Utah*

BUREAU OF ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS RESEARCH

R. Thayne Robson, Director
Frank C. Hachman, Associate Director

graduate school
of business
bureau of economic and
business research
university of utah

STAFF OF THE BUREAU OF ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS RESEARCH

Office Staff
Mari Lou Wood, Office Manager
Cathy Crawford, Administrative Assistant
Diane S. Gillam, Associate Accountant
Lee Carberry, Administrative Secretary
Gaylene Roethel, Administrative Secretary
Michael Khuu

Research Analysts, Research Assistants and Programmers
Jan Crispin
Peter Donner
Mark Oberg
Gary Ricks
Austin Sargent
James Wood

Senior Research Economists
Boyd L. Fjeldsted
Rodger Weaver

Production Staff
James B Peters, Graphics